

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

LAW OFFICES OF
RONALD M. ANDERSON**MAR 27 2006****PATENTS****TRADEMARKS****COPYRIGHT**Suite 507
600 - 108th Avenue N.E.
Bellevue, WA 98004
Phone (425) 688-8816
Fax (425) 646-6314

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

Date: March 27, 2006

To: Examiner Gregory Vaughn
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Facsimile No.: 1-571-273-8300

US Serial No. 09/897,292

Filing Date June 29, 2001

Attorney Docket No. COHE0002

From: Ronald M. Anderson, Registration No. 28,829

Facsimile No. (425) 646-6314

MESSAGE:

The following has been transmitted herewith via facsimile:

1. Facsimile Cover Page (1pg).
2. Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form (1pg)
3. Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented (1pg)

The information contained in this facsimile message is privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the recipient named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, any distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address by mail.

We have 3 pages to send, including this sheet. If any pages need to be retransmitted,
please call (425) 688-8816 within 15 minutes.

MAR 27 2006

PTOL-413A (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2008, OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/897,292
Examiner: VAUGHNFirst Named Applicant: GERALD CONEN
Art Unit: 2178Status of Application: PENDING, FINAL
OFFICE
ACTION

Tentative Participants:

(1) GREGORY VAUGHN (EXAMINER) (2) MICHAEL KING (APPLICANT'S ATTORNEY)

(3) _____

(4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: 3/28/06Proposed Time: 2⁰⁰ (AM/PM) (P)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

SEE ATTACHED

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

MICHAEL C. KING

Examiner/SPE Signature

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

44,832

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 123 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

It appears that the references cited by the Examiner perform different functions in a different manner, even though the references include language similar to that in the pending claims.

In the final office action, the Examiner has disagreed essentially stating that the words employed in the *arguments* as provided in the previously filed response are not identical to the words recited in the pending claims. While this is technically correct, the claimed invention still performs different functions in a different manner, and because of this, the sequences of steps recited in the pending claims logically lead to a conclusion that the menu template modifier disclosed by McNally is not equivalent to the recited menu template modifier, and thus, the pending claims distinguish over the cited art.

Significantly, these two steps appear distinctly different those implemented by McNally:

- (b) *enabling a user to select a desired menu from the menu database;*
- (c) *using said menu template modifier, said menu template, and a database record to generate the desired menu, said database record defining an appearance and a functionality of the menu items included within the desired menu;.*

According to McNally and conventional practice in the computer arts, once a menu or data structure has been created, the entire menu is stored in a memory for later use. Later, when that menu is selected for use, minimal processing is required to display the menu, since its structure is previously defined and stored. In accord with applicant's novel approach as defined by Claim 40, additional processing is required to display a menu that was previously designed, because the menu is not stored in a complete form.

Note in step "b", the desired menu *has already been developed*, and stored as an instruction set (i.e., as database record) as opposed to a complete menu. The database record contains sufficient information such that a processor (e.g., serving as the menu template modifier) can use the data contained in the database record with the menu template to recreate or generate the menu immediately before it is displayed to the user.

McNally refers to the use of a template (FIGURE 7), a processor, database records corresponding to potential menu items (i.e., the entrée, dessert, and appetizer data that are displayed in FIGURE 1), and modifiers (i.e., meat temperature, and vegetables to be served with an entrée) to initially generate a menu that is stored *in a complete form* in a database, such that a user can later retrieve that menu without regenerating it.

Furthermore, McNally does not teach or suggest that a menu template and a database record *defining an appearance and a functionality of the menu items included within the desired menu* are required to re-create the desired menu for display to a user.